



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

November 1, 2004
Page 4 of 7 Page(s)

Section 2. Reply to the Office re §102 objections

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of §102 objections raised in the Office Action, based on the following considerations. Examiner first suggests that all claims 1 through 10 in the instant application are anticipated by US patent number 4,381,623, to applicant Kositinen, issued May 3, 1983 (hereafter referred to as Kos '623). Examiner secondly proposes that Claims 1-3, 5, and 7 are anticipated under §102 by US patent number 4,825,590, to applicant Cullinane, issued May 2, 1989 (hereafter referred to as Cullinane '590). These two rejections will be addressed by Applicant in the above order.

Applicant proposes that the first suggestion is not correct on several counts. First, Kos '623 is not enabling of the present invention. It does not teach how to make the invention in clear enough detail to allow an observer to construct the device. In particular, Kos '623 describes an invention that is designed to stand inside a pot containing cut flowers, and deliver water thereto. The figures therein clearly show a set of legs supporting the main body of the device above a base of floral foam. Furthermore, the Kos '623 invention itself is not a container, but rather a funnel. It is designed to leak water from the bottom of said container onto a base, such as floral foam, which then delivers water to the cut flower stems.

The legs 22 pointed out by the Examiner are in fact support means for connecting a card holder 20 to the main water funnel 12. They do not function as attachment means to an external supporting body, nor does Kos '623 teach attachment to the edge of an outside container.

Thus, the Kos '623 patent teaches nothing of containing water (except briefly). Similarly, it teaches naught about stable attachment to the edge of any container, let alone a frail wine goblet or drinking glass. Therefore, this patent cannot serve as a valid basis for a §102 objection as against the instant application with claims as amended.

Now we turn to the second rejection, based on Cullinane '590. This invention is directed to a receptacle hanger and mount. The dimensions and overall size are not given in the specification. However, the specification and drawings are directed to a hanger of suitable size to hang over the edge of a church pew. Furthermore, the specification clearly states that the purpose of the hanger and receptacle is to hold



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

November 1, 2004
Page 5 of 7 Page(s)

flowers which can later be converted to a tabletop floral display. Clearly, any receptacle large enough to hold a tabletop floral display, and hang onto the edge of a church pew, will not serve to display cards tastefully, or in any other manner, on the edge of a drinking glass. In fact, the dimensions of the Cullinane '590 invention necessary to perform its cited purpose must necessarily render it unsuitable for service of the type the current invention is designed for.

Furthermore, the Cullinane '590 receptacle as described and portrayed has a flat bottom. This is necessary to hold a tabletop display, which itself must be flat-bottomed to be self-supporting on a table. The invention of the present application is not flat-bottomed, as it would be difficult to stably hold a flat-bottomed container on the sloping side of a drinking glass. Furthermore, a flat bottom is not critical to the function of the present invention. In this respect, Cullinane '590 teaches away from the current invention and claims as amended.



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

November 1, 2004
Page 6 of 7 Page(s)

Section 2. Reply to the Office re §103 objections

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of §103 objections raised in the Office Action, based on the following considerations. Examiner suggests that claims 8 and 9 in the instant application are rendered obvious by the Cullinane '590 patent in light of US patent no. 5,088,216, to applicant Wasilko, published Feb. 18, 1992 (hereafter referred to as Wasilko '216).

First, we respectfully direct Examiner's attention to the arguments presented against the Cullinane '590 citation in Section 2, *supra*. It is argued that since, for the reasons cited therein, Cullinane '590 is an inadequate reference for §102 objections, it is similarly inappropriately used for §103 objections to the current application, with claims as amended.

Secondly, we note again that the Cullinane '590 invention is directed toward the containing of tabletop floral displays. Such displays typically use floral foam, or even soil, to support the flowers. A grid of the type shown in Wasilko '216 is more appropriate for a smaller display, such as in Wasilko '216 or the present invention. Thus, for these reasons we do not agree with the §103 objections raised in the Office Action.



Law Offices of
KARLA SHIPPEY

MICHAEL SHIPPEY, PH.D.

November 1, 2004
Page 7 of 7 Page(s)

Remarks

The claims have been amended to remove duplicity and ambiguity, and to address concerns raised about claims limitations by Examiner (Page 5, 1st paragraph), as well as to remedy §112 objections.

Every effort has been made to constructively amend each area of the claims and specification in accordance with all of the examiner's observations in the above-referenced Office Action. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests a timely Allowance in this case.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Shippey, Ph.D. Registered Agent # 45,588

4848 Lakeview Avenue, Suite B
Yorba Linda, California 92886
Telephone (714) 693-9110